

REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicant has amended claims 4, 7, 9, 13, 17, 25, 28, 32, and 40 to include the subject matter of their base claims so as to secure allowance, the claims having been objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but containing allowable subject matter. Claims 11, 29, 39, 42-44 have been amended to change their dependencies. Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, 16, 23-24, 30-31, 35-38, 41, and 45 have been cancelled. Claims 4-7, 9, 11, 13-15, 17-22, 25-29, 32-34, 39-40, 42-44, and 46-48 remain for consideration in this application.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 10 has been cancelled. Claim 41 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 35. Claim 41 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 12-14, 16, 23, 24, 29-31, 35-39 and 41-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Michelsen (U.S. Patent No. 5,387,824). Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, 16, 23-24, 30-31, 35-38, 41, and 45 have been cancelled. Claims 29, 39, and 42-44 have been amended to change their dependencies, and now depend from and further define allowable claims.

Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 9, 14, 46, and 47. Specifically, claims 9 and 14 each recite "a pair of CMOS components, the first CMOS component connected to a hard coded buffer strength signal, and the second CMOS component connected to a selectable buffer strength signal." Michelsen does not teach or describe any such hard coded buffer strength signal, where the first CMOS component is connected to the hard coded buffer strength signal, and the second CMOS component is connected to a selectable buffer strength signal. Instead, Michelsen shows each CMOS component connected to a selectable buffer strength signal. There is no teaching whatsoever in Michelsen of a hard coded buffer strength signal. Still further, the

Office Action does not show what elements or teachings of Michelsen it alleges satisfy that requirement. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 14 are allowable.

Claim 46 recites “selecting predetermined or programmable enable inputs for the output stages.” Applicant has shown above that Michelsen does not teach or describe any predetermined enable inputs. Instead, Michelsen teaches that each input is selectable or programmable, not predetermined. Still further, there is no specific rejection in the Office Action showing where in Michelsen the Office Action believes the process of claim 46 to be shown. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 46 is allowable.

Claim 47 recites “selecting between the predetermined enable set and the selectable input set.” Applicant has shown above that Michelsen does not teach any selection of one of a predetermined or a programmable input, which is what is recited in claim 47. Instead, Michelsen teaches that each input is selectable or programmable, not predetermined. Still further, there is no specific rejection in the Office Action showing where in Michelsen the Office Action believes the process of claim 47 to be shown. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 47 is allowable. Claim 48 depends from and further defines patentably distinct claim 47 and is also believed allowable.

Claims 5-6, 15, 18-20, 26-27, and 33-34 were either objected to as dependent on a rejected base claim, or rejected outright. Applicant submits that each of claims 5-6, 15, 18-20, 26-27, and 33-34 depends directly or indirectly from and further defines one of patentably distinct claims 4, 14, 17, 25, or 32 and is also allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-7, 11, 15, 17-20, 25-28, 32-34 and 40 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 4, 7, 9, 13, 17, 25, 28, 32, and 40 have been amended to include the subject matter of their base claims so as to secure allowance.


Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claims 21 and 22.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims remaining in the application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections, and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2203.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5 Aug 2005


Daniel J. Polglaze
Reg. No. 39,801

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze
P.O. Box 581009
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009
T 612 312-2200
F 612 312-2250